UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,982	09/29/2000	Seth Bradley Noble	004098.P001	1722

7590   11/28/2005

Robert B O'Rourke
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER
LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 October 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14 and 16-45</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14 and 16-45</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the RCE filed 10/03/05.

2.   Claims 1, 16, 22, 28, 34, 35 and 39 were amended.

3.   Claim 15 is canceled.

4.   Claims 1-14 and 16-45 are pending in this office action.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

5.   The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 16, 22, 34, 35, 39 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §112,

second paragraph, are withdrawn.

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 and 16-45 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-14 and 16-25, 27-36 and 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,878,228 by Miller et al. (Miller). in view of U.S.

Patent 6,105,029 by Maddalozzo, Jr. et al. (Maddalozzo).

9.   With respect to Claim 1, Miller teaches a method, comprising:

a) generating, at a client, a request for an action to a be performed by a server to a data object, said data object being maintained by said server (Col. 5 lines 2-5 - request for one or more files);

b) sending a request message from said client to said server over a network (Col. 5 lines 6-17 - request is sent to sever) wherein said request message asks a response to a request (Col. 5 lines 2-8), wherein said request message further comprises:

1) a description of said action (Col. 5 line 60 to Col. 6 lines 8 - header information in each message includes a message type which identifies the related action);

2) a description of said data object (Col. 6 lines 65-67 - file descriptor);

3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of the response (Col. 5 lines 5-10 and Col. 6 lines 52-56 - numBytes);

c) maintaining an understanding at a client of those portions of the response that have been sent by said server and received from said network by said client (Col. 5 lines 29-45 - data integrity can detect message loss/gaps); and

d) issuing another request message from said client to said server for another portion of said response that has not been received at said client (Col. 5 lines 29-45 - missing gaps, ie. portions, will be requested).

Additionally, the functionality of the startByte and numBytes parameters allows for any portion of a file to be specifically requested.

Miller does not explicitly disclose the request messages asks for a first portion of response to said request, such that said first portion is less than the full size of said response. Maddalozzo teaches also teaches generating a request for an action to be

performed by a server to a data object (Col. 4 lines 12-30). The request can
subsequently be divided into multiple request messages, which ask for portions of the
response such that each portion is less than the full size of the response (Col. 5 lines 7-
10 and lines 41-52). This allows for a more efficient and timely access of a data object
(Col. 2 lines 11-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to take the method disclosed by Miller and modify it as indicated by
Maddalozzo such that the method further comprises sending a request message from
said client to said server over a network, wherein said request message asks for a first
portion of a response to said request, wherein said first portion is less than the full size
of said response and wherein said request message further comprises: 1) a description
of said action; 2) a description of said data object; 3) a first limit that defines the
maximum size of said first portion; c) maintaining an understanding at a client of those
portions of said first portion that have been sent by said server and received from said
network by said client. One would be motivated to have this, as it is desirable to have
more efficient and timely access to data objects (In Maddalozzo: Col. 2 lines 11-33).

10.   With respect to Claim 2, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of
Claim 1 and further teaches sending a reply message from said server to said client,
said reply message having at least a portion of said first portion of said response (In
Miller: Col. 5 lines 29-33 and lines 6-16).

11.   With respect to Claim 3, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of

Claim 2 and further teaches said reply message further comprises an indication of a

size of said response (In Miller: Col. 7 lines 1-23, particularly lines 15-17).

12.   With respect to Claim 4, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of

Claim 3 and further teaches said indication of a size of said response further comprises

an indication of how much of said response remains to be delivered to said client (In

Miller: Col. 7 lines 1-23 and Col.8 lines 23-40).

13.   With respect to Claim 5, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of

Claim 2 and further teaches said reply message is part of a burst of reply messages,

said burst of reply messages carrying said first portion of said response (In Miller: Col. 5

lines 10-18).

14.   With respect to Claim 6, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of

Claim 2 and further teaches said another request message comprises a starting

address (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 48-51) and an extent (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 52-55).

15.   With respect to Claim 7, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of

Claim 6 and further teaches said starting address corresponds to an address between a

starting address for said response and an ending address for said response (In Miller:

Col. 6 lines 48-51).

16.   With respect to Claim 8, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of

Claim 6 and further teaches said extent corresponds to an address between a starting

address for said response and an ending address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6

lines 52-55).

17.   With respect to Claim 9, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of

Claim 2 and further teaches said reply message further comprises an indication of a

capacity of said server (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 10-15 and Col. 9 line 64 - Col. 10 line 4).

18.   With respect to Claim 10, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 9 and further teaches said indication of a capacity of said server further

comprises a server burst size limit (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 10-15 and Col. 9 line 64 - Col.

10 line 4).

19.   With respect to Claim 11, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 2 and further teaches said another request message further comprises an

indication of a capacity of said client (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 6-10).

20.   With respect to Claim 12, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 11 and further teaches said indication of a capacity of said client further

comprises a client burst limit (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 9-10).

21.   With respect to Claim 13, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 2 and further teaches said another request message further comprises a

description of an object located at said server (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 65-67).

22.   With respect to Claim 14, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 13 and further teaches said another request message further comprises an

action to be taken by said server upon said request (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 41-45).

23.   With respect to Claim 16, Miller teaches a method, comprising:

        a) generating, at a client, a request for an action to a be performed by a server to

a data object, said data object being maintained by said server (Col. 5 lines 2-5);

   b) sending a request message from said client to said server over a network (Col. 5 lines 6-17) wherein said request message asks a response to a request (Col. 5 lines 2-8), wherein said request message further comprises:

   1) a description of said action (Col. 5 line 60 to Col. 6 lines 8);

   2) a description of said data object (Col. 6 lines 65-67);

   3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of the response (Col. 5 lines 5-10 and Col. 6 lines 52-56);

   c) performing, at said server, at least a part of said action to said data object (Col. 5 lines 10-16); and

   d) sending a burst of reply messages from said server to said client over said network in order to answer said request message (Col. 5 lines 10-16), wherein:

   1) each reply message within said burst of reply messages carries a different piece of the response(Col. 5 lines 6-16) 2) the aggregate of said different pieces is an amount of data that is not larger than said first limit (Col. 5 lines 6-16).

   Additionally, the functionality of the startByte and numBytes parameters allows for any portion of a file to be specifically requested.

   Miller does not explicitly disclose the request messages asks for a first portion of response to said request, such that said first portion is less than the full size of said response. Maddalozzo teaches also teaches generating a request for an action to be performed by a server to a data object (Col. 4 lines 12-30). The request can subsequently be divided into multiple request messages, which ask for portions of the response such that each portion is less than the full size of the response (Col. 5 lines 7-

10 and lines 41-52). This allows for a more efficient and timely access of a data object (Col. 2 lines 11-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Miller and modify it as indicated by Maddalozzo such that the method further comprises sending a request message from said client to said server over a network, wherein said request message asks for a first portion of a response to said request, wherein said first portion is less than the full size of said response and wherein said request message further comprises: 1) a description of said action; 2) a description of said data object; 3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of said first portion; c) performing, at said server, at least a part of said action to said data object; and d) sending a burst of reply messages from said server to said client over said network in order to answer said request message, wherein: 1) each reply message within said burst of reply messages carries a different piece of said asked for first portion 2) the aggregate of said different pieces is an amount of data that is not larger than said first limit. One would be motivated to have this, as it is desirable to have more efficient and timely access to data objects (In Maddalozzo: Col. 2 lines 11-33).

24.   With respect to Claim 17, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of Claim 16 and further teaches said client and said server can identify said response as an addressable block of data (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 19-21).

25.   With respect to Claim 18, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of Claim 17 and further teaches said request further comprises: 1) a first address of said

block of data that corresponds to a starting address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 48-51); and 2) a second address of said block of data that corresponds to a terminating address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 52-55).

26.   With respect to Claim 19, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of Claim 17 and further teaches said request defines: 1) a first address of said block of data that corresponds to a starting address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 48-51); and 2) an extent value that describes how much information beyond said starting address corresponds to the rest of said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 52-55).

27.   With respect to Claim 20, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of Claim 16 and further teaches said request indicates said response is to be crafted as only a section of a full response, said full response being the complete result of said action being performed on said data object (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 1-5).

28.   With respect to Claim 21, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of Claim 16 and further teaches sending a second request message from said client to said server over said network, wherein said second request messages asks for a second portion of said response (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 1-5).

29.   With respect to Claim 22, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of Claim 21 and further teaches said second request message further comprises said first limit and said second limit (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 6-10).

30.   With respect to Claim 23, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of Claim 21 and further teaches sending a second burst of reply messages from said

server to said client in order to answer said second request message (In Miller: Col. 5

lines 10-16).

31.   With respect to Claim 24, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 16 and further teaches said first limit is maintained by said client (In Miller: Col.

5 lines 8-10), and a third limit is maintained by said server (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 10-15),

said third limit defining the maximum amount of data that said server is allowed to send

to said client in answering said initial request message, wherein said third limit is less

than said first limit and said aggregate of said different pieces is an amount of data that

is not larger than said third limit (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 6-16).

32.   With respect to Claim 25, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 16 and further teaches at least one of said reply messages further comprises

the size of said response (In Miller: Col. 7 lines 1-23, particularly lines 15-17).

33.   With respect to Claim 27, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 16 and further teaches said client assigns a transaction identifier to said

request and includes said transaction identifier into said initial request (In Miller: Col. 5

lines 1-5 and Col. 6 lines 5-7).

34.   With respect to Claim 28, Miller teaches a machine readable medium having

stored thereon a sequence of instructions which when executed by a processing core

cause said processing core to perform a method, said method comprising:

        forming request message for sending over a network to a server, wherein said

request message asks a response to a request (Col. 5 lines 2-8) from a software

program for an action to be performed by a server (Col. 5 lines 1-17), wherein said initial

request message further comprises:

1) a description of said action (Col. 5 line 60 to Col. 6 lines 8);

2) a description of said data object (Col. 6 lines 65-67);

3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of the response (Col. 5 lines 5-10

and Col. 6 lines 52-56).

Additionally, the functionality of the startByte and numBytes parameters allows

for any portion of a file to be specifically requested.

Miller does not explicitly disclose the request messages asks for a first portion of

response to said request, such that said first portion is less than the full size of said

response. Maddalozzo teaches also teaches generating a request for an action to be

performed by a server to a data object (Col. 4 lines 12-30). The request can

subsequently be divided into multiple request messages, which ask for portions of the

response such that each portion is less than the full size of the response (Col. 5 lines 7-

10 and lines 41-52). This allows for a more efficient and timely access of a data object

(Col. 2 lines 11-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to take the method disclosed by Miller and modify it as indicated by

Maddalozzo such that the method further comprises forming request message for

sending over a network to a server, wherein said request message asks a first portion of

a response to a request from a software program for an action to be performed by a

server, wherein said first portion is less than the full size of said response and wherein

said initial request message further comprises: 1) a description of said action; 2) a

description of said data object; 3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of said first

portion. One would be motivated to have this, as it is desirable to have more efficient

and timely access to data objects (In Maddalozzo: Col. 2 lines 11-33).

35.   With respect to Claim 29, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 28 and further teaches said application software program can identify said

response as an addressable block of data (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 19-21).

36.   With respect to Claim 30, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 29 and further teaches said request further comprises: 1) a first address of said

block of data that corresponds to a starting address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6

lines 48-51); and 2) a second address of said block of data that corresponds to a

terminating address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 52-55).

37.   With respect to Claim 31, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 29 and further teaches said request defines: 1) a first address of said block of

data that corresponds to a starting address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 48-

51); and 2) an extent value that describes how much information beyond said starting

address corresponds to the rest of said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 52-55).

38.   With respect to Claim 32, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 28 and further teaches said request indicates said response is to be crafted as

only a section of a full response, said full response being the complete result of said

action being performed on said data object (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 1-5).

39.   With respect to Claim 33, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 28 and further teaches forming a second request message for sending to said

server over said network, wherein said second request messages asks for a second

portion of said response (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 1-5).

40.   With respect to Claim 34, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 33 and further teaches said second request message further comprises said

first limit (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 6-10).

41.   With respect to Claim 35, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 28 and further teaches receiving a burst of reply messages that were sent over

said network from said server in order to provide said answering to said initial request

message (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 10-16), wherein: 1) each reply message within said

burst of reply messages carries a different piece of said asked for first portion, wherein,

each of said different pieces is not larger than a second limit (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 8-9),

wherein the second limit defines a maximum datagram size that can be formed by said

server in said answering said initial request message (Col. 6 lines 46-47); and wherein

2) the aggregate of said different pieces is an amount of data that is not larger than said

first limit (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 9-10).

42.   With respect to Claim 36, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 35 and further teaches at least one of said reply messages further comprises

the size of said response (In Miller: Col. 7 lines 1-23, particularly lines 15-17).

43.   With respect to Claim 39, Miller teaches a machine readable medium having

stored thereon a sequence of instructions which when executed by a processing core

cause said processing core to perform a method, said method comprising:

forming a burst of reply messages in order to provide an answer to an request

message that was sent over a network by a client (Col. 5 lines 10-16), wherein said

request message asked for a response to a request from a client software program for

an action to be performed to a data object(Col. 5 lines 1-10), wherein:

a) said request message further comprised:

1) a description of said action (Col. 5 line 60 to Col. 6 lines 8);

2) a description of said data object (Col. 6 lines 65-67);

3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of the response (Col. 5 lines 5-10

and Col. 6 lines 52-56); and

b) wherein:

1) each reply message within said burst of reply messages carries a different

piece of said asked for response(Col. 5 lines 6-10) and wherein

2) the aggregate of said different pieces is an amount of data that is not larger

than said first limit (Col. 5 lines 6-10).

Additionally, the functionality of the startByte and numBytes parameters allows

for any portion of a file to be specifically requested.

Miller does not explicitly disclose the request messages asks for a first portion of

response to said request, such that said first portion is less than the full size of said

response. Maddalozzo teaches also teaches generating a request for an action to be

performed by a server to a data object (Col. 4 lines 12-30). The request can
subsequently be divided into multiple request messages, which ask for portions of the
response such that each portion is less than the full size of the response (Col. 5 lines 7-
10 and lines 41-52). This allows for a more efficient and timely access of a data object
(Col. 2 lines 11-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to take the method disclosed by Miller and modify it as indicated by
Maddalozzo such that the method further comprises forming a burst of reply messages
in order to provide an answer to an request message that was sent over a network by a
client, wherein said request message asked for a first portion of a response to a request
from a client software program for an action to be performed to a data object, wherein
said first portion is less than the full size of said response and wherein: a) said request
message further comprised: 1) a description of said action; 2) a description of said data
object; 3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of said first portion; and b) wherein:
1) each reply message within said burst of reply messages carries a different piece of
said asked for first portion and wherein 2) the aggregate of said different pieces is an
amount of data that is not larger than said first limit.

44.   With respect to Claim 40, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations
of Claim 39 and further teaches receiving a second request message that was sent by
said client over said network, wherein said second request message asked for a second
portion of said response (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 1-5).

45.   With respect to Claim 41, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations
of Claim 40 and further teaches sending a second burst of reply messages from said
server to said client in order to answer said second request message (In Miller: Col. 5
lines 6-16).

46.   With respect to Claim 42, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations
of Claim 39 and further teaches maintaining a third limit, said third limit defining the
maximum amount of data that is allowed to be sent to said client in answering said initial
request message (In Miller: Col. 5 lines 10-15).

47.   With respect to Claim 43, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations
of Claim 42 and further teaches said aggregate of said different pieces is an amount of
data that is not larger than said third limit if said third limit is less than said first limit (In
Miller: Col. 5 lines 10-15).

48.   With respect to Claim 44, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations
of Claim 39 and further teaches at least on of said reply messages further comprises
the size of said response (In Miller: Col. 7 lines 1-23, particularly lines 15-17).

49.   Claim 26, 37, 38 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Miller in view of Maddalozzo and U.S. Patent 5,845,280 by
Treadwell, III et al. (Treadwell).

50.   With respect to Claim 26, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations
of Claim 16 but does not explicitly disclose returning an object identifier that can be
used for subsequent requests on the same object. However, Treadwell shows it is well

known in the art that data objects can be assigned an object identifier (Col. 2 lines 25-29) that can be used in subsequent requests (Col. 7 lines 8-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Miller in view of Maddalozzo and modify it as indicated by Treadwell such that at least one of said reply messages further comprises an object identifier that said client may use to refer to said data object for subsequent requests that invoke said data object. One would be motivated to have this as it reduces overhead in data transmission procedures (Col. 2 lines 29-35 of Treadwell).

51.   With respect to Claim 37, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations of Claim 35 but does not explicitly disclose returning an object identifier that can be used for subsequent requests on the same object. However, Treadwell shows it is well known in the art that data objects can be assigned an object identifier (Col. 2 lines 25-29) that can be used in subsequent requests (Col. 7 lines 8-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the machine readable medium disclosed by Miller in view of Maddalozzo and modify it as indicated by Treadwell such that at least one of said reply messages further comprises an object identifier that may be used to refer to said data object for subsequent requests that invoke said data object. One would be motivated to have this as it reduces overhead in data transmission procedures (Col. 2 lines 29-35 of Treadwell).

52.   With respect to Claim 38, Miller in view of Maddalozzo and Treadwell further

teaches said method further comprises assigning a transaction identifier to said request

and including said transaction identifier into said initial request message (Col. 5 lines 1-

5 and Col. 6 lines 5-7 of Miller).

53.   With respect to Claim 45, Miller in view of Maddalozzo teaches all the limitations

of Claim 39 but does not explicitly disclose returning an object identifier that can be

used for subsequent requests on the same object. However, Treadwell shows it is well

known in the art that data objects can be assigned an object identifier (Col. 2 lines 25-

29) that can be used in subsequent requests (Col. 7 lines 8-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to take the machine readable medium disclosed by Miller in view of

Maddalozzo and modify it as indicated by Treadwell such that at least one of said reply

messages further comprises an object identifier that said client may use to refer to said

data object for subsequent requests that invoke said data object. One would be

motivated to have this as it reduces overhead in data transmission procedures (Col. 2

lines 29-3 of Treadwell 5).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 571-272-

3986. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Lazaro
November 22, 2005

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER